

## REMARKS

The indication that claims 6 - 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, is acknowledged.

By the present amendment, the features of objected to claim 6 have been incorporated into independent parent claim 1, with claim 6 being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof, such that claim 1, as amended, represents objected to claim 6 rewritten in independent form, and claim 1 and therewith its dependent claims should now be in condition for allowance.

Further, by the present amendment, objected to claims 7 and 8 have been amended to depend from any one of claims 1 - 5, and such claims should also now be in condition for allowance.

As to the rejection of claim 13 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in that it contradicts claim 9 from which it depends, such rejection has been overcome by the amendment of claim 13 to depend from claim 1, while providing proper basis for the features of claim 13. Thus, applicants submit that this rejection should now be overcome, and since claim 13 depends from claim 1, which should be in condition for allowance, claim 13 should also be in condition for allowance.

As to the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Kleinwaks; the rejection of claims 1 and 3 under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Feygin; the rejection of claims 3 - 5 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Kleinwaks in view of Reininger; the rejection of claims 9, 10 and 12 - 15 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Kleinwaks or Kleinwaks in view Reininger, further in view of Nappi et al; and the rejection of claims 9 - 11 under

35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Kleinwaks or Kleinwaks in view of Reininger and further in view of Nappi et al and Edwards et al; such rejections are traversed insofar as they are applicable to the present claims, as amended.

As pointed out above, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the features of objected to claim 6 therein, such that claim 1, as amended, should now be in condition for allowance. Since the remaining claims in this application, i.e., claims 2 - 5 and 7 - 15 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, applicants submit that all claims should now be in condition for allowance, noting that the rejection of claim 13 under 35 USC 112 has been overcome, as pointed out above. Thus, applicants submit that claim 1 and the dependent claims should now be in condition for allowance and a discussion of the cited in relation to such claims is considered unnecessary.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicants submit that all claims present in this application should now be in condition for allowance, and issuance of an action of favorable nature is courteously solicited.

To the extent necessary, applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in the fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (Case: 1369.46153X00), and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP

/Melvin Kraus/ MK  
Melvin Kraus  
Registration No. 22,466

MK/jla  
(703) 312-6600